h8fdatih 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, New York, N.Y. 4 15 Cr. 0867(RMB) V. 5 MEHMET HAKAN ATILLA, et al., 6 Defendants. 7 -----x 8 August 15, 2017 9 9:14 a.m. 10 Before: 11 HON. RICHARD M. BERMAN, 12 District Judge 13 14 **APPEARANCES** JOON H. KIM 15 Acting United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York 16 BY: SIDHARDHA KAMARAJU 17 DAVID DENTON Assistant United States Attorneys 18 FLEMING RUVOLDT PLLC 19 Attorneys for Defendant BY: CATHY A. FLEMING 20 ROBERT J. FETTWEIS 21 HERRICK, FEINSTEIN LLP (NYC) Attorneys for Defendant 22 BY: THOMAS E. THORNHILL 23 - also present -24 Jonathan Lettieri, Pretrial Services Officer 25 Asiye Kay, Turkish Language Interpreter

25

1 THE COURT: How are you all? MS. FLEMING: Good morning, your Honor. 2 3 THE COURT: Good morning. Please be seated. 4 So, as you know, we are here this morning to discuss a 5 bail application, the issue of bail, for Mr. Atilla. I've read the papers quite carefully, and I'm happy to hear from counsel, 6 7 if they wish to be heard further. 8 I would like to say at the outset that, as the lawyers 9 sort of may know, our purpose is not to be discussing the guilt 10 or the innocence of the defendant in these proceedings, 11 although we do touch on issues such as the weight of the 12 evidence, etc., etc., but the presumption of innocence is very 13 much alive and well, and the defendant is presumed to be 14 innocent unless and until such time as a jury, for example, 15 determines, if it did, that he was not. So with that introduction, I am happy to hear from 16 Ms. Fleming. Ms. Fleming, do you wish to be heard? 17 18 MS. FLEMING: Thank you, your Honor. 19 Your Honor, we have a Turkish interpreter. Do we need 20 to swear her? 21 THE COURT: No. We don't need to do that, but we will 22 note for the record that we have a certified Turkish 23 interpreter and ask Mr. Atilla if he is able to understand these proceedings with the help of the interpreter? 24

THE DEFENDANT: I understand.

MS. FLEMING: Your Honor, thank you. And the Court is well aware of the standards under the Bail Reform Act. So I am just going to highlight that we are trying to establish what would be the least restrictive conditions that will serve the purpose of bail, which is to secure and give the Court assurances that the defendant will appear for further proceedings under the least restrictive conditions, and incarceration is the most restrictive conditions that could be imposed.

We have proposed a package which the government made light of in its papers, and I want to amplicate it a little further. We did propose an unsecured — a bond that was secured by property that is in Turkey. We are prepared to sign over the papers and the rest of it to be held in escrow so the government has a better shot at getting it if they think that is an issue. His wife is prepared to cosign. They already have his passports. They already have an agreement not to retain travel documents. He has agreed to electronic monitoring. He will report, and the rest.

But what they didn't refer to and what we put in our papers and what we have discussed with the government is he's also willing to agree to any conditions that are suggested by the government or imposed by the Court that will help satisfy his burden, and we had suggested or included what some other courts have done. One of the things they have done is put

software on computers to make sure that the computers only are doing discovery and not going anywhere else. We have suggested video cameras on an apartment. The government said an apartment of his own choosing. We are happy to have the government either approve it or be involved in the selection of an apartment.

We have been racking our brains and thought about the following, and I'm well aware of the Court's opinion in Mr. Zarrab's case about private jails and a concern that only the very wealthy have them, and despite the government suggesting that Mr. Atilla is wealthy, he's not poor but he's not wealthy. He has many years of working and has saved up moderate savings, but he's not wealthy. He doesn't have the means to flee.

But what we would suggest is the following. We have been working as much as we can work. Counsel has been seeing him in the jail, and I'll get to the conditions of that because it does implicate his due process to some degree. Virtually every day, some counsel has met with him in the jail to try to go over what's going on or he has been working on trying to get through the Turkish discovery in the case with challenging restrictions at that. We are proposing that in addition to him being in an apartment with electronic monitoring, video cameras, whatever software the government and the technology people say is approved to them, perhaps putting in an alarm

system with a code that only a few people have the code to and not Mr. Atilla, and we would suggest that since he will be working at the law firms, either mine or the Herrick firm, virtually seven days a week, we can have somebody go get him at the apartment, escort him to the law firm, and take him back. And, in addition, we can arrange to have somebody acceptable to the government and known to the government who can live in the premises. And it will be the obligation of the persons who are there that if he's not there or he doesn't show or somehow disappears, to notify law enforcement immediately. It's not the private security guards. He doesn't have the means to have private security guards, but it's a pretty close approximation of making sure he is accounted for all the time.

And he will be in a situation where he will be working with counsel. We have trial ten weeks away, and we are working very hard, very diligently to get this done, your Honor. And it's really a way to assure that he's going to be here. And it puts the burden on people, including people who have licenses to practice law, to make sure that if for some reason he's not there, law enforcement is notified right away.

So it seems to me that those and any other combinations that either the government wants to suggest or the Court wants to suggest should certainly be able to assure his presence. In addition to surrendering his — they already have his travel documents, but agreeing not to get any more, not

having the ability to go get them, etc. He has agreed to give a waiver of extradition to be held in escrow. He has agreed and his wife has agreed to cosign.

Honor, meeting with potential witnesses. I had the opportunity to go to his home, which is an apartment about five minutes from his — the bank where he works. And despite all the suggestions that Halk Bank isn't really to be trusted because they won't admit what he has done wrong, I had the opportunity to visit Halk Bank. It is a major commercial bank of very sizable proportions, a real financial institution. I have photos of his home. I met with his wife and his son. She is willing to sign all the papers, risking everything they have ever worked for, and despite — and I do make the distinction between him and the codefendant. The codefendant does have a lifestyle and he did have the means to abscond if he wanted to. I'm not suggesting he would have, I don't know. But he has the means to do it; Mr. Atilla does not.

And so I think that there has to be a combination unless you are going to say that somebody who has the sad fortune of only being a visitor to the country — and we have conceded he does not have ties here except he came here on business, but has the misfortune of coming here, is locked up for their own safety in jail. So I say that up front saying that whatever it takes that will secure his release — and I

point out to the Court, this is not an application that was made lightly. It wasn't made at the beginning of the case. It took until defense counsel got into the case, reviewed the government's case in discovery and we saw what was there. It took until we got to know the defendant to be willing to say that we are willing to have him in our offices seven days a week to work with him.

He is actively, actively working on the defense of the case with us and cooperating and working well with us. And it is this point that we really believe that this is a good time to make the application.

So with that and saying as many bells and whistles as the Court wants and whatever the government wants to suggest, we are willing to do.

I want to talk for a minute about how it is implicating his due process rights, and I don't say this lightly and I don't fault the Bureau of Prisons. We understand that they have a huge institution that they have to take care of. We understand they have rules. But it has really been a challenge — and that's a nice word — for trying to deal with getting in and going through the discovery. Put aside the fact that if I'm working in my office on something and I need to get a question answered quickly, I simply don't have the means to get to the client and say what's the answer to this. It has to go on a list and I have to wait until I get to the MCC and I

get in and I can ask him and the moment is gone. Put aside that I have to arrange to have a Turkish interpreter to make sure that I have something — if it is a Turkish document that needs to be read and interpreted.

We have logistical issues when we get there. There are timing issues if you are in the middle of something, and the MCC has been pretty good about letting us stay past 7:30 but by 8 o'clock we are out the door. If there is a problem getting in because something has happened on one of the floors — and we don't fault the MCC for this — we sit downstairs and wait for hours at times before we get in. If the rooms are all full, we wait until the rooms are — a room becomes available for somebody. If there is a lockdown, we can't get in and we try to work. We know what the general lockdowns are. But if there is a lockdown because something has happened, we can't get in. And it really has been a challenge.

If you're working on something and something comes up and you don't have those materials with you, now you can't say let me go get those materials — and this is a case where there is a lot of materials — let me go get those materials and we can cross-reference them.

I am representing to your Honor that we have worked unbelievably diligently to try to get into this case and understand it, and it has been really difficult to do this.

And it has been exacerbated by the fact that Mr. Atilla is incarcerated. We can't reach him by phone. We do have email to a limited degree, but it is not when you need it at the time you need him. So that has really been a problem.

So now if you go back and you just look at what the factors are that are really of the most concern, the government makes a big deal about the nature of the charges. It is the IEEPA conspiracy and the bank fraud conspiracy. And your Honor is right, and you have properly said in a prior bail application with a codefendant that what will happen at trial will happen at trial and you will look at that, and you have also said, and we appreciate it, that the presumption of innocence is right here and stands with Mr. Atilla.

The government says he's facing decades in jail. I don't accept that. I've done the calculations roughly, to the extent I can, under the guidelines, the defense team has. Our guidelines' calculations come out generously for the government's sake. Maybe we're wrong. Maybe we haven't seen the adjustments or know what they are going to try to load up in the event he is convicted, and I say "in the event" with all seriousness, but we come up with somewhere around 60 months as a worst-case scenario for Mr. Atilla. There is no loss that we see to any victims, and the bank fraud is proposed by a loss table, and under the IEEPA, which is a harder one, the analysis looks at somewhere around at its strongest, without loading up

on adjustments and looking at what we thought was there, it may be a five-year sentence. So it is not decades in jail, as the government suggests in its briefs.

You have to look at the strength of the case, and I would like to spend a minute on this because we have spent time on it. The government talks — and their papers are loaded with what is in the search warrant applications, and they spent a lot of time talking in generalities, as opposed to what the specific evidence is against Mr. Atilla. And they talk about this glorious plan we have about sanctions against Iran and how serious it is. None of us dispute that. We get it. There are serious sanctions with Iran. And people who violate it, it is serious charges. But when you strip all of that away and look at what the case is against Mr. Atilla, it is a pretty different story.

What happened, your Honor, as we piece it together, is that there was an investigation that went on for a number of years in Turkey that kind of hit — it became public in December of 2013. And it turned out there were recordings of approximately — there were about 3,000 recordings, according to pen registers and things that we have looked at. There were a number of people who were charged, including the codefendant here. Mr. Atilla was never charged by the Turkish authorities. Since then, the courts in Turkey have deemed those wiretaps to be illegal, and they have deemed that those wiretaps were

obtained including on the basis of false documentation and the like. So there is an issue with -- even under the liberal standard of foreign evidence, there is a real issue on that.

In addition, we are going to have evidentiary issues because there are references to transcripts and there are references to transcripts we don't have and there are no underlying recordings. The government is using as a roadmap a Turkish report by people who are now fugitives and by people who are being prosecuted by the Turkish government. They are still going to have authentication issues. I don't know how they are going to do it, and I actually was going to bring up at the end of the conference that maybe we ought to talk about how we are going to figure out — maybe it is a motion in limine, but there is going to be serious authentication issues in this case.

But the bottom line is the case is predicated on something that was done in Turkey in 2013 that became public where Mr. Atilla was never charged, and, in fact, he is a complainant and intercepted improperly by people and by having things that were done improperly in Turkey. He had — he was a complainant. And I don't want to give away the defense. We would do it in an ex parte submission, but the government is wrong on certain of its allegations and identifications, which we are going to be able to prove.

So the strength of the case is simply not what the

government says. And that also is a big and powerful incentive for Mr. Atilla to clear his name. He's worked at the Halk Bank and it is a serious commercial back. He has worked there for 22 years, and he is really looking forward to clearing his name here.

We put in the papers, your Honor, the problems with the recordings, and, again, even under the lower standard, they would never meet the standards of American admissibility, even under the lower standards for foreign-seized evidence. It would be shocking to me if they get into evidence.

been charged with a crime, including in Turkey, in this investigation. He has no criminal history. He was steadily employed at Halk Bank for 22 years. He rose up through the ranks. He was not a political person at all. He has been married for 22 years. He has got a 20-year-old son who is in university. He is a citizen of Turkey. He has been a model prisoner since he has been at the MCC and the MDC and the MCC. You know the history of him going back and forth. His history and characteristics speak well to his character.

And I understand the government's reluctance to accept his word. I'm asking your Honor to weigh his word that he is willing to pledge his word as well as his life's savings and his ownership to the court.

And, finally, in terms of danger to the community,

it's really -- he possessed a firearm in Turkey. That's a big deal in Turkey because it is hard to be licensed to have a firearm in Turkey. He doesn't have a firearm here. He's the not going to have a firearm here. And he certainly does not pose a danger to the community, and he certainly would not pose one when given all the bells and whistles that we have suggested in terms of any release on bail under any conditions that he would have and particularly since he is going to be with lawyers seven days a week between now and the trial.

So, your Honor, with every bit of sincerity and earnest pleading that I can put before this Court, I am asking that you release him on bail on any set of conditions that the Court will consider that will be the least restrictive that will meet the requirements of the Bail Reform Act that will give you reasonable assurance that he will appear for trial and will also allow us to prepare adequately and meet the October 30th -- 31st -- 30th trial date that we have in this matter. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Fleming.

Counsel for the government.

MR. KAMARAJU: Yes, your Honor, and I don't want to belabor or repeat too much from our papers so I will just respond to a few points that defense counsel made.

Initially, it appears clear and I think defense counsel even acknowledged that the defense has to concede the

facts that show that the defendant is a flight risk. He has, without dispute, no ties to the United States. He has only visited here on a handful of occasions, the government's understanding, for business. He has, balanced against that, a number of substantial connection to the nation of Turkey, and we addressed your Honor about some issues in connection with this bail application and also his codefendant Zarrab's bail application, about Turkey's ability or willingness to extradite its citizens back to the United States for purposes of criminal prosecution. Our understanding is that they will not do that even in the face of a waiver of extradition. So the defendant has a substantial reason to want to get back to Turkey, and once he gets there, there is certainly no guarantee that he will ever come back.

Defense counsel also, while trying to minimize the defendant's resources, noted that he is not a poor man. He has, by his accounting, a substantial quantity of cash located in Turkey, certainly more than enough to abscond. He may not have the wealth that his codefendant Zarrab has but he also doesn't need it. The question for the bail application is not whether he is on par with the wealth of his codefendant, it is does he have sufficient wealth and the resources to abscond. And the answer is clearly yes, your Honor. He has, by his own accounting, approximately \$100,000 in cash in Turkey in addition to all the illiquid assets that are there.

So what you have is is you have a situation with a foreign national with no reason to remain in the country other than this prosecution and every reason to want to return to a place that will not send him back here to face prosecution and which is beyond the jurisdiction of both the Court and the reach of the government. You have a bail application in that instance where it is very similar to the one already considered by your Honor with respect to the codefendant Zarrab. All of those factors in connection matter a lot.

And counsel try to distinguish Zarrab in a couple of ways, and I would like to talk about those before turning to some of the bail package elements that she alluded to. The first way is counsel suggested that the potential sentence in this case is not as significant as the government articulates. Initially, just as a matter of the statutory maximum -- and obviously your Honor, in the event of a conviction, would do a guidelines' calculation and would also advise the defendant of the potential statutory maximum penalties here. The bank fraud statute alone carries a 30-year maximum penalty. The IEEPA statute carries an additional 20 years. The guidelines calculation that defense counsel articulate --

THE COURT: When you say "additional," you mean in addition --

MR. KAMARAJU: Separately, the statute itself carries a 20-year penalty.

And the guidelines' calculation that defense counsel articulated is premised, as I understood it, their allegation or their assertion that they are not able to identify loss. The Court has already found that the Indictment alleges loss with respect to the bank fraud counts. That was on Zarrab's motion to dismiss the indictment. The Court spent a lengthy amount of time actually discussing the allegations of loss, whether they include potential intended loss, which is sufficient to satisfy the bank fraud statute, or actual loss.

And just as with Zarrab, when you look at the transactions that are ultimately at issue in this case, they are in the millions of dollars. So the guidelines' calculation that defense counsel proffered, I'm sure in the event of a conviction they will argue to your Honor. Your Honor now knows that the government will be arguing a guidelines' calculation that is substantially higher and the defendant knows that. So the fact of where the sentence may end up does not deter from right now he is facing a potential sentence in the decades. So he has an incentive to flee in addition to the fact that he has such substantial roots in Turkey. So that distinction between his case and Zarrab's case simply doesn't hold up, your Honor.

The other sort of attempted distinction is the weight of the evidence. And as your Honor said, and you said in connection with the Zarrab application as well, we are not here to try the case against the defendant. We are not here to try

the case against the defendant on a bail application. We are not here to test the government's evidence or to prove the defendant's guilt. But what the defense would have you believe is that in the context of a bail application, charges that have already been approved by a magistrate judge, charges that have been approved by a grand jury that the defendant would roll the dice that at trial he would be able to persuade a jury that on the face of it these calls don't mean what they are, that the remainder of the government —

THE COURT: These calls don't mean what they say?

MR. KAMARAJU: What they say.

That the other evidence that the Court has already sort of considered in connection with the Zarrab bail application, all of which would be admissible as part of the conspiracy against this defendant, that that evidence wouldn't counsel against guilt. And all of this is premised on the idea that the defendant wishes to clear his name. He has expressed that through his plea of not guilty. But the question for your Honor is is there a substantial risk that given the opportunity to avoid even the potential of facing that lengthy sentence, is there a reasonable probability that he is going to flee? And the answer is yes, your Honor, because he has the incentive to, he has the ability to, and he has a place to go. So when you couple all of those things together, the only real distinction between this case and the Zarrab case is we are talking about

two different defendants. All of the flight factors -THE COURT: Different charges, too.

MR. KAMARAJU: Yes, though there is a point that I would like to respond to that is sort of articulated a few times in Mr. Atilla's bail submission, which is he says that he's not charged with the most serious offenses. I'm not sure what the rubric is for determining what that is, but he is charged with a national security offense and he is charged with defrauding U.S. financial institutions. So those are serious offenses however you want to compare them to what's left, and those are the same charges, minus the crime conspiracy charge and the money laundering charge, that Mr. Zarrab is facing.

So when you look at that, then the only real question is is there any bail package that can mitigate his flight risk. And the bail package that the Court already rejected with respect to Mr. Zarrab I think provides guidance as to how it should treat Atilla's bail package. Counsel says that they will accept any condition, whether it is computer monitoring, video monitoring, alarm systems. All of those things beg one question. First, who is doing the monitoring? In Zarrab's proposed package, it was Guidepost. It is unclear to me who in Mr. Atilla's package it would be, whether it would be the government who would be doing the monitoring, whether it would be a private firm. But in any event, what that get us into is the thicket that the Court recognized, which is whether we are

talking now about conditions of release, which the Bail Reform Act does authorize, or conditions of detention, which are not authorized under the Bail Reform Act. And this is a point that your Honor picked up on in connection with Zarrab's proposed bail package, and there your Honor noted that when we start getting to this place where we are talking about private guards having to ensure the defendant's place, or this instance I suppose government 24-hour monitoring, those are conditions that are present at the MCC.

The MCC is a place right now where the defendant is monitored on a regular basis, where his computer usage is monitored, where his telephone usage is monitored. All they are talking about is shifting that from the MCC to a place in the community. So just as with Zarrab's private security guard package, this sort of expansive "we'll give you anything approach" takes us right back to a place where your Honor didn't want to go, which is a situation in which we're discussing conditions of detention and not release. And many courts — and we cited them in the Zarrab application and they are cited in the Court's order on denying Zarrab bail — many courts have held that that is inappropriate.

So that's the broad problem with the package that that's sort of been articulate by Atilla. We've gone through and addressed the specific principles in our papers, so I am not going to spend a lot of time on that. But the basic

fundamental flaw with all of them is everything that the defendant proffers as securing his presence — everything and everyone — are based in Turkey. They don't actually provide any meaningful security to ensure that he would come back here. So I think from that perspective, given the fact and particularly the already substantial bail package that the Court found didn't mitigate the risk of flight or flight risk, there is no reason to believe that it would mitigate the flight risk with respect to this defendant.

I just want to briefly touch on the due process concerns that Ms. Fleming raised. That argument was also raised by Zarrab in connection with his bail application, and the government has and will continue to try to help defense counsel as much as possible by pointing to specific evidence, by providing a laptop, in the first instance, as we have done for both the defendants. But this is not the first case with substantial evidence that involves a detained defendant. Your Honor has seen cases, for example, in which there are thousands of wiretaps and defendants are detained.

It cannot be a due process violation, in other words, to detain a defendant simply because there is a substantial amount of evidence. If that were the case, then the Bail Reform Act would include that as one of the factors. It does not. The Bail Reform Act does not discuss hindrance to trial preparation as one of the factors that the Court is to

consider.

And if your Honor thinks about it, what basically would happen in that circumstance is anytime the government has a substantial volume of evidence, defendants would get bailed. That can't be the law. And in fact it is not the law, and there are no cases cited, at least to our knowledge or to the government's research, that support that proposition.

So I don't think there is a due process argument there. And, frankly, that did not sway the Court when it came to Zarrab, who has the precisely same evidentiary challenges and is also located currently at the MDC. So I don't think any of these factors should sway the Court from what is a straightforward application of the Bail Reform Act, a straightforward application of the case law. You have a foreign national facing a substantial sentence with ties to a country where we may never be able to get him back.

Unless your Honor has any questions?

THE COURT: I don't.

MS. FLEMING: May I just briefly respond, your Honor, to just a couple of points?

THE COURT: Sure.

MS. FLEMING: The first is there is a very big difference between Mr. Atilla and Mr. Zarrab. Mr. Zarrab was arrested. Mr. Atilla came here knowing about the arrest of Mr. Zarrab. No fear, came here, and was arrested a long time

after it. Mr. Zarrab has been here a lot longer and has had a lot longer to digest the evidence, and, by the way, there is a lot more evidence against Mr. Zarrab -- many, many, many more tapes, much, much, much more evidence and the volume is much greater.

And I just would point out to the Court that under the Bail Reform Act, 18 U.S.C. Section 3142, that the factors are — the standard is that to consider whether there are conditions of release that will reasonably assure the defendant's presence. I'm not trying to just shift defenses, your Honor. I think it is overkill with everything we have suggested. But I really think that it is appropriate for this defendant to have bail. I think there are conditions that will reasonably assure this Court of his presence, and I think that the Bail Reform Act makes it very clear that if there is a way to give reasonable assurance to this Court that he will appear for proceedings, that the Court should figure out a way to give bail and we are requesting that you do so.

THE COURT: All right. So first let me assure you that this being Mr. Atilla's bail application, I have and am considering it independent of Mr. Zarrab or anybody else except as the cases may support precedent for whatever I determine to do.

So, all right. This is going to take a couple of minutes. I want to go over all the factors I have considered.

So by submissions dated July 20, 2017 and July 28, 2017, defense counsel requests bail for Mr. Atilla. Defense counsel proposes the following bail package, although as Ms. Fleming has indicated, she is also comfortable with any other conditions that may be imposed by the Court. But the conditions proposed by the defense are:

- 1. A personal recognizance bond cosigned by Mr. Atilla's wife in any amount proposed by the Court and secured by the following property -- Mr. Atilla's family primary residence in Istanbul worth approximately \$350,000 US.
- 2. Mr. Atilla's vacation home in Izmir, Turkey worth approximately \$140,000.
- 3. Farmland in Izmir, Turkey owned by Mr. Atilla and his wife, worth approximately \$160,000. In addition, investment property of Mr. Atilla's in which he does not as yet have title, and also a savings account at Halk Bank, where he is employed, currently valued at approximately \$140,000.

The defense have also proposed electronic monitoring, reporting to Pretrial Services on whatever schedule is requested and subject to surprise visits from Pretrial Services, home detention in an apartment that Mr. Atilla will rent in Manhattan, surrender of passports, and, as I mentioned at the outset, any other conditions imposed by the Court, including pen registers on telephones, signed waivers of extradition, video and telephone monitoring, and computer

surveillance.

By submission dated August 7, 2017, the government, as has been indicated in oral presentations today, opposes bail.

Among other things, the government states there is no combination of conditions that would reasonably secure the defendant's appearance in court, including the bail package proposed by Mr. Atilla.

The Pretrial Services' report has been done, as it is in every case, dated March 28, 2017, and updated as recently as August 9, 2017, and it states that there is no condition or combination of conditions to reasonably assure Mr. Atilla's appearance in court, and Pretrial Services recommends that Mr. Atilla be detained.

Pretrial Services states that Mr. Atilla poses a risk of nonappearance for the following reasons. One is the possession of a Turkish passport. Two is no familial or residential ties to the United States. Three is the fact that he is a citizen of another country and has no legal status in the United States except as a visiting businessperson originally. Four, strong familial, residential and employment ties to Turkey, and, five, frequent international travel. This is from the report. I am summarizing.

They also say, Pretrial Services does, that Mr. Atilla poses a risk of danger for the following reasons: One is financial danger owing to the nature of the instant offenses,

and two is possession of a firearm located in Turkey.

The statute in question is 18 United States Code Section 3142, which in pertinent part reads as follows:

Release on personal recognizance or unsecured appearance bond.

The judicial officer shall order the pretrial release of the person on personal recognizance or upon execution of an unsecured appearance bond in an amount specified by the Court subject to the condition that the person not commit a federal, state or local crime during the period of release unless the judicial officer determines that such release will not reasonably assure the appearance of the person as required, or will endanger the safety of any person — any other person or the community. The burden of proof is clear and convincing evidence that a defendant presents a danger to the community, and it is preponderance of the evidence with respect to flight risk.

Citations include <u>United States v. Mercedes</u>, at 254 F.3d 433, a Second Circuit case from 2001, where the Court stated that "the Court, evaluating risk of flight, is to consider the nature of the offense, the weight of the evidence against the suspect, the history and character of the person charged, and the nature and seriousness of the risk to the community." The cite is <u>United States v. Dreier</u>, 596 F.Supp.2d 831, a Southern District case from 2009.

So let's consider those factors that do need to be considered in a bail application, one being the nature and circumstances of the offenses charged. Here Mr. Atilla is charged in two counts of an otherwise four-count indictment. He is charged with, one, conspiracy to violate the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 United States Code Sections 1701 to 1707, and also the Iranian Transactions and Sanctions Regulation at 31 C.F.R. parts 560 and 561. That is with respect to Count Two of the Indictment. He is also charged with conspiracy to commit bank fraud, in violation of 18 United States Code Section 1344. He is charged in Count Three with that offense.

The defense argues that Mr. Atilla is not charged with any crime of violence. The government argues that the indictment alleges a scheme by defendants, plural, to help evade U.S. sanctions on behalf of a wide array of designated Iranian government and government-owned entities. That scheme allegedly involved, among other things, the use of front companies, false documents, bulk cash shipments and stripping of wire information. Through that alleged scheme, the defendants helped the government of Iran and Iranian entities process millions of dollars worth of financial transactions through the U.S. financial system and also that the American financial institutions would not have otherwise processed.

The Court finds with respect to this factor, the first

factor, that the charges against Mr. Atilla are serious and, relatedly, that the defendant, if he were to be convicted — and he is presumed, as I said at the outset, to be innocent and he has maintained his innocence throughout, but if he were to be convicted, he could face a substantial term of imprisonment. So this first factor weighs in favor of detention.

The second factor is the weight of the evidence against the person. Defense counsel argues that the lack of evidence against Mr. Atilla favors his release on bail and that, at best, he is a minor figure. Defense counsel states that the indictment is unusually bereft of any factual detail with respect to Mr. Atilla. She also argues that the offenses in which Mr. Atilla is charged are classic white-collar offenses and neither includes any allegations of violence.

The defense also argues that Mr. Atilla is named in none of the 28 overt acts set forth in the indictment, and none of the overt acts even refer either to Mr. Atilla or to Halk Bank. Defense counsel notes that based on their review of the pen registers purporting to list more than 3,000 calls and texts intercepted by the Turkish authorities, there are perhaps twelve conversations in which Mr. Atilla appears to have been involved. The government has produced recordings and corresponding transcripts for, according to the defense, only four of those twelve conversations. It has produced transcripts alone of six additional conversations allegedly

involving Mr. Atilla for which the defense has been told there are no corresponding recordings.

For two alleged conversations between Mr. Atilla and Mr. Zarrab, both on July 15, 2013, there apparently is neither a recording nor a transcript. This is the defense speaking. This highly unusual set of circumstances promises serious evidentiary issues under both the Fifth and Sixth Amendments. It is hard, according to the defense, to imagine the admissibility of such evidence.

The government counters with respect to the weight of the evidence against Mr. Atilla. "Mr. Atilla" -- this is a quote from the government -- "played a critical role in allowing Iran to leverage its oil resources in an unfettered manner. By helping Zarrab complete illegal shipments that were purchased with Iranian oil proceeds to Iran, Mr. Atilla and Mr. Zarrab," according to the government," and their co-conspirators helped Iran ease the pressure imposed by U.S. sanctions. In particular, Mr. Atilla used his considerable influence at Halk Bank, as one of its top executives, to use the bank to conceal Mr. Zarrab's sanctions-busting transactions while at the same time attempting to shield Halk Bank from secondary sanctions that could have been levied by the Office of Foreign Assets Control."

That's all the government speaking.

"Additionally," the government states, "the evidence

against Mr. Atilla includes, among other things, emails and other electronic communications, intercepted telephone calls and bank records. This evidence establishes," according to the government, "conclusively the existence of the sanctions evasion network dedicated to furthering the 'economic jihad' referred to in the draft letter to Ayatollah Khomeini found in Mr. Zarrab's email.

"Moreover, this evidence shows clearly that this network moved millions of dollars illegally for Iranian entities, including Bank Mellat, the National Iranian Oil Company, the Naftiran Intertrade Company, and Mahan Air. Furthermore, the evidence linking Mr. Atilla to the Halk Bank portion of the scheme is," according to the government, "substantial.

"Through, among other things, intercepted communications and emails, the government will establish at trial that Mr. Atilla knew that Zarrab was processing fraudulent transactions through Halk Bank and gave instructions on how to make the fraudulent documents more believable and that he helped facilitate those transactions and did so knowing such transactions violated U.S. sanctions."

That's the government speaking.

And the government also says that "Intercepted communications between Mr. Zarrab and Mr. Atilla and between Zarrab and other co-conspirators shows that Mr. Atilla was

helping to facilitate transactions for Zarrab that were contradictory to assurances given to U.S. regulators."

"Also," according to the government, "Mr. Atilla's role in the scheme to evade U.S. sanctions was primarily to use Halk Bank, along with others, to conceal Mr. Zarrab's shipments of gold and currency to Iran that violated U.S. sanctions. The defendant's efforts to conceal these shipments included, among other things, creating and using false documentation to make it appear that Mr. Zarrab's transactions were for humanitarian purposes that would exempt the transactions and Halk Bank from the sanctions regime.

"Mr. Zarrab and Mr. Atilla discussed the gold and purported food transactions and how the scheme would work. For example, in one call" — this is related by the government — "Mr. Zarrab explained how the purported food transactions would be conducted in the same manner as the previous gold transactions, including a description of how U.S. dollars could be used as part of the scheme. In other calls, Mr. Atilla and Mr. Zarrab discussed the kinds of records that Mr. Zarrab would provide to Halk Bank to document these transactions, including the fact that Mr. Zarrab's documents were on their face not credible and needed to be revised. For instance, in one call, it is alleged that Mr. Atilla noted that the amount of foodstuffs reflected on Mr. Zarrab's documents could not possibly be shipped on the vessels of the size that Mr. Zarrab

claimed to be using, and Mr. Atilla instructed Mr. Zarrab in the future to double-check the purported transaction amounts and the purported ship capacities," and, "according to the government, "in other call Mr. Atilla and Mr. Zarrab discussed the fact that Mr. Zarrab's documents claimed that wheat Mr. Zarrab was purportedly to ship originated in Dubai which Mr. Atilla pointed out was impossible."

Jurisdictional and evidentiary and other issues are currently the subject of a pretrial motion to dismiss. The defense reply is due I believe on or about August 21, and brief oral argument is scheduled for September 7, 2017, at 11 a.m.

These matters are not being decided or determined at this time. Cites are <u>United States v. Bellomo</u>, 944 F.Supp.

1160, a Southern District case from 1996, where the Court stated, "The issue now before the Court is whether there is a risk that defendant will flee the jurisdiction or endanger others before trial can be held, not whether he is guilty or innocent of the charges in the indictment."

I'm also relying on United States v. Fama, at 2013 WL 2467985, a Southern District case from 2013, where the Court stated, "The Court recognizes the difficulty inherent in assessing the government's case before trial and is mindful not to reach any conclusions about defendant's guilt or innocence."

For purposes of this bail application, the Court finds that the evidence against Mr. Atilla appears at this stage as

previously described and appears to be strong. This factor weighs in favor of continued detention also.

The third factor is the history and characteristics of Mr. Atilla. Here the defense argues that there is no evidence of any intent or ability on his part to flee the jurisdiction. The defense states that defendant has no aliases, he's not independently wealthy, nor does he have access to huge sums of money. The defense also states that Mr. Atilla and his wife are willing to pledge their entire life savings to assure the Court of his appearance.

The government argues that Mr. Atilla is deeply rooted in Turkey. He has lived there his entire life and has a wife and son there. He has spent more than 20 years working at Halk Bank, which we have earlier established is a bank 51 percent approximately owned by the Republic of Turkey, which has afforded him opportunities to travel around the world. He and his wife own outright at least three properties and invest in a fourth in Turkey. He has — this is, again, the government speaking — he has, according to his Pretrial Services interview, more than \$100,000 in the bank in Turkey.

Mr. Atilla is 46 years old. He is married, has one adult child. He is a citizen of Turkey. There is no dispute that Mr. Atilla has no ties to the United States. There is also no contention that Mr. Atilla has any criminal history apart from the allegations in this case.

He has worked at Halk Bank virtually all of his adult life. He has traveled worldwide for employment, according to Pretrial Services. His steady employment, lack of criminal history, and strong home life weigh in favor of release, but are offset in this case by his citizenship, residency, employment in Turkey and ties to Turkey, his financial resources, and his complete lack of ties in the United States, and so this factor also weighs in favor of detention.

Additionally, I should point out that property located in Turkey is not real collateral for a bond before a U.S. Court because neither the Court nor the government has the ability to forfeit the property. Thus, in essence — and this is the government's position — what Mr. Atilla has proposed is an unsecured \$2 million bond.

So this third factor also weighs in favor of continued detention.

Finally, we come to the fourth factor, the nature and seriousness of the danger to any person or the community that would be posed by the person's release. And here I refer to comments of others who have concluded that undermining U.S. sanctions against Iran may well pose a threat to the United States.

A former U.S. undersecretary for terrorism and financial intelligence, Mr. Adam Szubin, has stated the following. This is a quote: "Iran continues to be the world's

leading state sponsor of terrorism and plays a significant role in destabilizing the Middle East region. It supplies funding, weapons to Hizballah and to the Assad regime and to the Houthis in Yemen." This is a quote from Mr. Szubin. "It continues to develop its ballistic missile program in contravention of U.N. Security Council provisions, and it continues to violate human rights." This quote comes from Mr. Szubin's testimony before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs May 25, 2016.

So I come to the conclusion that this fourth and final factor also weighs in favor of detention. And so that being the case, I am not going to approve a bail package.

I did want to add this thought, however. The Court is taking judicial notice of the fact that there have been in this matter an unusual stream of out-of-court contacts between the executive branches of the governments of Turkey and the United States regarding this case and apparently, from published reports, regarding the proposed repatriation of defendants Zarrab and Mr. Atilla without a trial. This raises the issue that I wish to mention, and the issue is whether the government of Turkey, at the least, would have any interest and incentive to support bail requirements, including the obligation to appear in court and not to flee the jurisdiction. I raise this as a concern. As I say, the four factors without this also support continued detention.

Based upon the facts presented here and after having

reviewed carefully the parties' submissions and applicable authorities, and for the reasons that I have stated, I respectfully conclude that the government has shown by a preponderance of the evidence that Mr. Atilla poses a risk of flight and that no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure his appearance at trial.

I have taken serious note of his desire to clear his name in this matter, and I believe that that is best accomplished by staying on the trial schedule that we currently have in place.

Thank you very much.

MS. FLEMING: Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes.

MS. FLEMING: We are not part of any conversations with the Turkish government. I want the Court to know that.

If, however, we can get assurances from authorities that they would abide an extradition or other conditions, may we reapply for bail?

THE COURT: You have to look at the statute about when you can make such an application.

MS. FLEMING: I understand.

THE COURT: I was pointed and careful to note that the four conditions that support — that one considers in determining whether there should be bail all favor continued detention and that my mentioning this as an additional point

was separate and apart from those four conditions.

MS. FLEMING: I understood, but I wanted the Court to know we are not part of any conversation --

THE COURT: I appreciate that, and Mr. Rocco I think had mentioned that as well. Thank you very much.